

-13-

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 14-18 and 32 have been cancelled, and claims 3-4, 7, 10, 12, 16, 19-20, 23, 26, 28 and 30-31 have been amended. Claims 3-13 and 19-31 are pending.

Previous independent claims 1, 14 and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 3 and 19 have been re-written in independent form, and other claims have been amended to depend from claim 3 or 19 as appropriate. Independent claims 30 and 31 have been amended to include the same subject matter as claims 3 and 19.

The Examiner is thanked for his time and consideration during an interview on March 30, 2005 in which claim 3 was discussed. Although no agreement was reached at that interview, the Examiner and his supervisor suggested that this after-final amendment be submitted, and that full consideration of the amendment and remarks would be given.

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 17 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangarajan. These claims have been cancelled, and therefore this rejection is no longer applicable. This action does not reflect any agreement with or accession to the rejection, but rather is taken to limit the claims in an effort to obtain allowance in this after-final period. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the cancelled claims in a subsequent continuation application.

In the final Office Action, claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Besaw. These claims have also been cancelled. The above remarks also apply to these claims.

In the Office Action, claims 2-13, 18-29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Rangarajan and Besaw. To the extent this rejection is still applicable to the pending claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 recites a method for displaying managed object data associated with managed resources in a computer system. The method includes retrieving a data dictionary containing a master view definition, task definitions, view

definitions and managed object data definitions, and further defining a use case for each task definition that defines a mapping of a view definition to a portion of a managed object data definition

A master view corresponding to the master view definition is displayed on a graphical user interface of the computer system to enable a user of the computer system to provide a managed object selection and a task selection to apply to the managed object selection. Such selections are received from the user via the graphical user interface.

A task definition is selected from the data dictionary that corresponds to the task selection from the user. Based on the managed object selection, a use case is selected that is associated with the task definition in the data dictionary and that corresponds to the managed object selection. The use case identifies a view definition defining a view in which to display managed object data related to the managed object selection to which a management function associated with the task selection is applied.

A view corresponding to the view definition is displayed on the graphical user interface, and the managed object data related to the at least one managed object selection is obtained and displayed within the view on the graphical user interface.

The Examiner is referred to Figures 2-4 of the application as filed for an illustrative embodiment of the method of claim 3.

One of the important aspects of claim 3, which was explained during the above-mentioned interview, is that the view in which the managed object data is displayed is selected from the data dictionary based on a managed object selection from a user, along with a task selection to be applied to the selected managed object. Figures 3 and 4 illustrate this process according to one embodiment. The selection of the managed object and task are made from a master view that is displayed based on a master view definition in the data dictionary. Figures 1 to 3 illustrate this operation according to one embodiment.

One of the advantages of the technique of claim 3 is that managed objects can be added to a system without the need to modify the operation of the object

management application, because the method does not rely on *a priori* knowledge of how managed object data for managed objects should be displayed. Rather, the method selects the views for displaying managed object data based on the selection of the managed objects and tasks from the user. Thus, when a new managed object is added to the system, all that is required is that the various definitions within the data dictionary be updated, and the method automatically displays managed object data in a view customized to the managed object.

Besaw discloses a system having a "management information portal" or MIP 134 via which a browser-based client can obtain network information. Included in the MIP are various libraries 205 and 207, and a user configuration database 209. The user configuration database 209 specifies, on a per-customer basis, which modules and filters are to be utilized in obtaining and presenting network information to the customer. As shown in Figure 7, the MIP parses the user configuration database to identify and apply user-specific security and display filters in generating results to be displayed to the user.

Paragraphs 27-31 of Besaw, which are referred to in the Office Action, refer to specific aspects of "customized management services" provided to a customer or user, including the above-described functionality of the user configuration database 209. As stated in paragraph 31, an edit manager (EM) 304 allows a service provider to edit a customer configuration file that may be a record, text file, etc. and is stored in the user configuration database 209. Each configuration record contains customer-specific information such as display preferences and security filter definitions. Additionally, paragraph 49 mentions that the configuration record is parsed to determine which modules from the module library are applicable to the customer. Paragraphs 42-46 describe examples of security and display filters that are invoked when a customer logs into the MIP 134, resulting in the creation of subsets of nodes for which information is to be displayed. These filters are specified in XML.

The final Office Action points in particular to paragraph 27 of Besaw, which is summarized above. While the Office Action concludes that the

database maintained by the customer views module amounts to a data dictionary, it is respectfully submitted that it does not amount to a data dictionary as set forth in claim 3, nor does Besaw teach or suggest the specific functionality of claim 3 regarding how views for displaying managed object data are selected.

The data dictionary of claim 3 contains data elements that associate both an identity of a managed object, and a task to be applied to that object, to a definition of a view to be used to display managed object data. The data dictionary is used in a specific fashion – it is used to retrieve the view based on a managed object selection and a task selection received from a user via a master view that is also defined in the data dictionary. Such functionality is nowhere found in Besaw.

In Besaw, to the extent that data is displayed in any customized fashion, it appears to be done only on the basis of the identity of the customer without any prior selection by that customer of managed objects or tasks to be applied to the managed objects. Moreover, any such customized displaying is not done based on customer selections from a master view that is defined in a data dictionary, as is required by claim 3.

Referring to paragraphs 42 et seq. of Besaw which describe the operation of a display filter 500, the display to the customer can be customized to certain network nodes and/or interfaces of an network allocated to the customer. There is no description of tailoring the display based on the customer's selection of managed objects or tasks. Referring to paragraph 48, the MIP accesses the user configuration database 209 based solely on security verification of the customer via a login. Again, there is no description of any customer selection of managed objects or tasks that influence how the MIP displays network management information to the customer. Furthermore, there is no description of obtaining a master view from the customer configuration database that is presented to the customer to enable the customer to make selections that lead to the display of other views that are specific to those selections. What is fairly inferred from the description in Besaw is that the portal simply chooses a

-17-

customer-specific display format based on the identity of the customer, period. Such functionality falls far short of that recited in claim 3.

Based on the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Besaw does not teach or suggest the above-discussed portions of claim 3, and therefore the combination of Rangarajan and Besaw cannot render claim 3 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Thus, claim 3 is seen to be allowable in view of these references. The remaining claims incorporate, either directly or indirectly, the same features of claim 3 discussed above, and therefore are seen to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

If the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deems a fee necessary, this fee may be charged to the account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0901. If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,


James F. Thompson, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 36,699
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: EMC01-12(01047)

Dated: April 11, 2005